DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 733 CE 024 129

AUTHOR Kerwin, Michael A.
TITLE Development of an Instrument to Measure the Teaching Behavior of Adult Educators.
INSTITUTION Piedmont Technical Inst., Roxboro, N.C.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Lifelong Learning Research Conference (College Park, MD, February 1-2, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adult Educators; *Adult Learning; *Attitude Measures; *Behavior Rating Scales; Continuing Education; Instruction; Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Participation; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Behavior; *Test Construction; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Andragogy; Knowles (Malcolm S)

ABSTRACT

The Educational Development Questionnaire (EDQ), a 60-question rating scale, was designed to measure the teaching behavior of adult educators in terms of Malcolm Knowles' descriptions of andragogical (self-directed) and pedagogical learning processes. The EDQ was first used during 1978 winter classes by 961 students who rated the teaching behavior of 74 randomly selected instructors at four North Carolina two-year colleges. Factor analysis yielded seven factors which accounted for 25% of the total variance: student involvement, instructor control, distrust and detachment of the instructor, professionalism, counseling, individual inattention, and organization. All factors with the exception of student involvement had been identified in previous adult education research as dimensions of student-perceived teaching behavior. Identification of aspects of student involvement in the design and operation of educational programs as a separate factor is particularly significant, since this is a primary difference in Knowles' concepts of andragogy and pedagogy. A second phase of the analysis determined that students perceived more controlling behaviors or conditions in curriculum classes than in continuing education classes. Further research using the EDQ or a modified questionnaire including student involvement items and a broader sample of educators may lead to a clearer difference between teaching behaviors of the two groups. The EDQ may also help improve adult teacher self evaluation. (MEK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183743

Development of an Instrument to Measure the Teaching Behavior of Adult Educators

Mike Kerwin

Piedmont Technical College

Roxboro, North Carolina 27573

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael A. Kerwin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper read as a part of the Lifelong Learning Research Conference, College Park, Maryland, February 1-2, 1980

CE 024 129

A Caveat

I have two sons, ages 7 and 10, and over the Christmas holidays I went with them to see two of the popular space films showing at local theaters. Driving home from one of these films, I started to think about some of the things that I had put aside in order to be with my children--and this presentation was one of them. At that time, it occurred to me that the study of the teaching behavior of adult educators was rather insignificant and unexciting compared to the exploration of black holes in space or the confrontation with a hostile intruder with terrifying destructive power. On the other hand, it also occurred to me that our knowledge of the universe and the means that we have for obtaining that knowledge are probably as limited and as primitive as our knowledge of the teaching behavior of adult educators and the means we have for obtaining that. Although I hesitate to develop this observation further, it serves as a caveat for my presentation: this report on the development of an instrument designed to measure the teaching behavior of adult educators is what science fiction writers call a probe--a preliminary stage in the exploration of a relatively unexplored area. My primary purpose here is to stimulate your interest and support to continue research on the teaching behavior of adult educators.

Introduction

Reporting the findings from his survey of 112 adult educators in Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, Homer Kempfer (1979, p. 23) stated that respondents tended to agree that adult education courses are organized and taught differently than are curriculum offerings. In fact, Malcolm Knowles (1970, pp. 38-54; 1973, pp. 42-43, 102-103; 1975, pp. 18-21, 31, 33) has conceptualized these differences in the teaching process by comparing teacher-directed or pedagogical learning and self-directed or andragogical learning. Nevertheless, little, if any, research has been done to test the hypothesis that adult education courses are indeed organized and taught differently than are curriculum offerings. One probable cause for this neglect is that no one has developed an instrument designed to discriminate between the teaching behavior of curriculum instructors and the teaching behavior of adult educators. In fact, most measures of teacher behavior have been derived from analyses of either the classroom behavior of curriculum instructors or the concepts of leadership behavior. (Examples of the first type include questionnaires developed by Solomon et al., 1963; Solomon, 1966, pp. 35-47; Deshphande et al., 1970, pp. 289-305; and Croft and Cotter, 1974, pp. 1-5. Examples of the second type include questionnaires developed by Gibb, 1955, pp. 254-263; Isaacson et al., 1964, pp. 344-351; and Costin, 1971, pp. 410-412.) The purpose of this presentation is to report on the development of an instrument designed to measure

teaching behavior in terms of andragogy and pedagogy, to describe how it has been used, and to suggest how adult educators could assist in the development and use of this instrument.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument described in this presentation is called the Educational Description Questionnaire (EDQ). In its present form, the EDQ consists of sixty statements describing an educator's behavior. All of the statements on the EDQ are derived from Malcolm Knowles' descriptions of andragogical and pedagogical learning processes and each of the statements corresponds to an attitudinal statement on the Educational Orientation Questionnaire, which was developed and validated by Herschel Hadley (1975) to assess an educator's orientation with respect to a numerical andragogical-pedagogical continuum. The EDQ is designed to be administered to adult learners who are participating in a group-learning situation with an instructor. The instructions on the EDQ tell learners to respond to each statement in terms of how frequently a condition or behavior has occurred. Learners indicate that the behavior or condition has occurred almost always, often, occasionally, seldom, or almost never. (A copy of the EDQ is attached to this paper as an appendix.)

Research Population

The first time that it was used, seventy-four instructors, randomly selected at four of North Carolina's two-year colleges,

administered the EDQ to people enrolled in one of his or her classes during the 1978 winter quarter (Kerwin, 1979). Most of these instructors taught in general education (36 percent) and technical programs (25 percent) with the remaining being divided almost equally between vocational and continuing education programs (19 and 18 percent). Table 1 shows the composition of the research sample by institution, institutional setting, and program area.

As illustrated in Table 2, the instructors who composed the research sample had varying personal and background characteristics. Of the instructors who participated in the study, 69 percent were between twenty-nine and forty-nine years of age, with the rest almost equally divided between the younger and older groups. The proportion of male instructors (53 percent) was slightly larger than that for female instructors (47 percent). Most of the instructors were employed full time (82 percent) and had between three and twelve years of teaching experience (60 percent). Almost half of the instructors who participated in the study had more than three years of working experience in a nonacademic area. Twenty-five percent indicated that they had more than three years of military experience.

When the personal and background characteristics of teachers in curriculum and continuing education programs are compared to the research sample, the only salient difference is that of employment status: instructors in

Table 1.--Composition of the Research Sample by Institution, Institutional Setting, and Program Area (N=74)

Two-Year Colleges	Institutional Setting	Number of Instructors by Program Area				Total
		General Education	Technical Education	Vocational Education	Continuing Education	
Durham Technical Institute	Urban	6	6	2	3	18 (24%)
Gaston College	Urban	4	3	6	1	15* (19%)
Piedmont Technical Institute	Rural	4	7	4	4	19 (26%)
Wilkes Community College	Rural	13	3	2	4	22 (30%)
Total		27	19	14	13	*
Percentage		36	26	19	18	**

*One instructor at Gaston College did not indicate his program area.
**This number does not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table 2.--Personal and Background Characteristics of Teachers in the Research Sample (N=74)

	Age			Sex		Employment Status		Years of Teaching Experience			Years of Nonacademic Experience			Years of Military Experience		
	28 or under	29-49	50 or over	female	male	full-time	part-time	less than 3	3-12	more than 12	less than 3	3-12	more than 12	less than 3	3-12	more than 12
Total	10	49	12	34	39	59	13	16	41	11	35	21	11	34	8	3
Percent	14%	69%	17%	47%	53%	82%	18%	24%	60%	16%	52%	31%	16%	76%	18%	7%

Table 3.--A Comparison of Background Characteristics of Students in Curriculum and Continuing Education Programs (N=961)

Age			Sex		Employment Status		Student Status	
28 or under	29-49	50 or over	female	male	full time	other	full time	part time
•53	42	24	75	51	63	63	20	108
••45%	35%	20%	60%	40%	50%	50%	16%	84%
•••574	202	8	433	383	185	636	730	93
••73%	26%	1%	53%	47%	23%	67%	89%	11%

•Continuing Education Students (Total)

••Percent

•••Curriculum Students (Total)

continuing education tended to be employed part time instructors whereas instructors in curriculum programs tended to be employed full time.

Between two and twenty-six students in one of each of these instructors' classes--a total of 961 students--completed the EDQ. Most of these students were in curriculum programs (86 percent). As illustrated in Table 3, continuing education students, compared to curriculum students, tended to be employed full time, were more evenly distributed over a broad age range, and were more likely to be classified as part-time students.

Results and Discussion

Once the data were collected, punched onto computer cards and verified, the student ratings on each of the sixty items on the EDQ were factor-analyzed, using the principal-axis method and a varimax rotation (Barr, 1976, pp. 112-119). Seven factors were extracted, accounting for 25 percent of the total variance. Although the labels for these factors are somewhat arbitrary, they are intended to reflect what the general character of the item cluster is: student involvement, control, distrust and detachment, professionalism, counseling, individual inattention, and organization. The factors and the items that loaded highly on them ($\pm$.45) are presented in Table 4.

The Student Involvement factor accounted for the greatest amount of variance of the ratings (25 percent of the common variance). Fourteen of the items on the EDQ

Table 4.--Item Composition of Factors on the Educational Description Questionnaire

Item Number	Loading
Factor 1: Student Involvement	
2. The instructor has encouraged students to examine their own feelings, attitudes, and behaviors.	.60
6. Students have been allowed by the instructor to actively participate in deciding what is to be learned and how it is to be done.	.67
8. Students have been helped by the instructor to organize the content and sequence of learning activities.	.71
10. The instructor has obtained suggestions from students on how to improve his teaching.	.61
12. The instructor has shown each student that the student's abilities and experiences are respected and valued.	.54
18. Students have been helped by the instructor to choose and develop their own directions for learning.	.69
24. The student has been allowed by the instructor to evaluate his achievement.	.62
28. The instructor has helped the student define changes in behavior which the student desires and the instructor helps him try to make.	.51
33. Students have been encouraged by the instructor to create their own learning activities and materials.	.60
38. The instructor has provided students with opportunities to develop warm relationships with him and among students.	.46
47. The instructor has been concerned primarily with the needs of the student.	.50
52. The instructor has helped each student learn what the student decides will aid him in achieving his personal goals.	.50

Table 4.--(continued)

Item Number	Loading
57. Group activities have been used by the instructor rather than such methods as lectures.	.52
59. The instructor has planned units of work with the students.	.57
Factor 2: Control	
7. The instructor has given examinations regularly.	.73
9. The instructor has evaluated students' achievements and assigned grades.	.71
19. Decisions about what should be taught, when, and how have been made by the instructor.	.54
34. The instructor has required assignments and graded them.	.69
Factor 3: Distrust and Detachment	
53. The instructor has taken great pains to prevent students from taking advantage of him.	.68
54. The instructor has played it safe and has not taken changes.	.69
58. The instructor's relationships with students have been impersonal.	.62
Factor 4: Professionalism	
17. The instructor has explained clearly.	.47
23. The same standards have been maintained by the instructor in his program as in other accredited courses.	.60
29. Students have been trusted by the instructor to behave reasonably.	.67
32. The instructor has known his subject matter and has the ability to explain or demonstrate it clearly and interestingly.	.57

Table 4.--(continued)

Item Number	Loading
48. Grades in this class reflect a student's grasp of the subject or skill taught.	.52
Factor 5: Counseling	
31. Students have been helped by the instructor to free themselves of fixed habits and patterns that block their growth.	.42*
40. Students have been encouraged by the instructor to critically evaluate their society and try new behavior.	.68
42. The instructor has acted as if maturity depends more on continuing growth in self-understanding than on growth in knowledge.	.66
Factor 6: Individual Inattention	
15. Individual differences among students have not been allowed by the instructor.	.65
20. The instructor has seldom known the average students as separate individuals.	.58
Factor 7: Organization	
36. Evaluation in this class is based entirely on the course objectives.	.47
45. Students have been told by the instructor what should be learned and how it should be done.	.72

*Although this item did not meet the .45 criterion, it was loaded highest on this factor and was logically related to it.

were found to be highly loaded on this factor, and all of these items describe a high degree of student involvement in the class and with the instructor. Eight of these items (6, 8, 18, 24, 28, 33, 52, 59) describe the active participation of students in planning, carrying out, and evaluating what has been done in the class. Four items (2, 10, 12, 47) describe a high degree of instructor concern for and support of students. The remaining two items (38, 57) describe a high frequency of interaction between instructor and students and among students. All of these items were judged andragogical when they were constructed.

Factor 2 is the Instructor Control factor (16 percent of the common variance). Three of the four items (7, 9, 34) describe the instructor's behavior as an evaluator of student achievement. The fourth item (19) indicates that decisions about course content and learning activities have been made by the instructor. All of these items were judged pedagogical when they were constructed.

The items in Factor 3 describe the distrust and detachment of the instructor (8 percent of the common variance). The three items (53, 54, 58) describe the instructor's avoidance of risks, distrust of students, and impersonality. Each of these items was judged pedagogical when it was constructed.

Factor 4 is the Professionalism factor (20 percent of the common variance). The five items in Factor 4 (17, 23, 29, 32, 48) describe the instructor's trust that

students will behave reasonably, his knowledge of subject matter and ability to communicate it, his fairness in grading, and his maintenance of program standards. All of the items in Factor 4 were judged pedagogical when they were constructed.

The three items in Factor 5 (31, 40, 42) describe the counseling behaviors of the instructor (8 percent of the common variance). Each indicates that the instructor has been concerned with the students' lives outside the classroom. All three were judged andragogical when they were constructed.

Factor 6 is the Individual Inattention factor (8 percent of the common variance). The first item (15) states that the instructor does not recognize individual differences among students, and the second item (20) states that the instructor has seldom known the average students as separate individuals. Both were judged pedagogical when they were constructed.

The two items in Factor 7 (36, 45) describe the instructor's organizational behavior (8 percent of the common variance). The first item states that evaluation in the class is based on the course objectives; the second states that the instructor has told students what should be learned and how it should be done. Both items were judged pedagogical when they were constructed.

<u>A Comparison of the Factors Extracted from the EDQ and the Dimensions of Student-Perceived Teaching Behavior Identified in Other Studies</u>

Six of the seven factors extracted from the EDQ have

been identified as dimensions of student-perceived teaching behavior in previous studies. The Instructor Control factor was identified by Deshpande as the Evaluation Function. The Distrust and Detachment factor was identified by Solomon as Criticism, Disapproval, Hostility versus Tolerance. The Professionalism factor was identified by Croft and Cotter as the Clarity factor. The fifth factor, Counseling, was identified by Isaacson as the Instructional Skill dimension and by Deshpande as the Motivation factor. The Individual Inattention factor was identified as the Individual assistance factor by Deshpande and Croft and Cotter. The Organization factor was identified as the Organization Behavior factor by Gibb and Isaacson, as the Structure factor by Deshpande, and as the Precision, Organization versus Informality factor by Solomon.

On the other hand, the Student Involvement factor differs significantly from any of the factors identified in most, if not all, of the earlier studies of learner-perceived teaching behavior. These studies identify factors describing the instructor's ability to interact with students, his ability to stimulate class discussion, his permissive and flexible behavior, and his friendliness, but none of the factors identified in these studies contain items describing the student's involvement in the design and operation of an educational program--the primary difference, according to Knowles, between andragogical and pedagogical learning processes.

Differences Between the Teaching Behavior of Curriculum Instructors and Continuing Education Instructors

A second phase of the analysis process determined that students perceived differences between the teaching behavior of curriculum and continuing education instructors. This phase consisted of two parts, and the TTEST procedure was used for both parts (Barr, 1976, pp. 275-277). First, summary scores were computed for both continuing education and curriculum instructors on each of the factors of student-perceived teaching behavior. These summary scores were derived by (1) summing responses made by each student to each of the items in a factor and determining a mean item score on each factor for each student and (2) averaging the mean item scores on each factor for each student in each of the two groups. Although this procedure does not have absolute regard to the contribution of each item to a factor, several researchers have indicated that it is satisfactory for most purposes (Boshier and Riddell, 1978, p. 173; Morstain and Smart, 1974, p. 85; Alwin, 197[illegible] 209; [illegible]). In addition, this procedure fac[illegible] comparability to future research. Next, the t-st[illegible] was used to test the difference between the summary scores for both groups of instructors on each of the factors.

The results of this phase of the analysis process are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.--Differences Between Summary Scores for Curriculum and Continuing Education Instructors on Seven Factors of Student-Perceived Teaching Behavior

Factors of Student-Perceived Teaching Behavior	Summary Scores* Curriculum Instructors N=60	Continuing Education Instructors N=13	Differences Between Scores
Student Involvement	2.47	1.80	.68**
Control	1.87	3.10	1.23**
Distrust and Detachment	***	***	***
Professionalism	1.77	1.55	.22**
Counseling	2.92	3.40	.48**
Individual Inattention	3.36	3.89	.53**
Organization	3.58	4.00	.42**

*Lower scores indicate a greater frequency of a condition or behavior whereas higher scores indicate a lesser frequency of a condition or behavior.

**Significant at the .001 level.

***Using the SAS TTEST procedure, summary scores could not be derived for this factor. The note on the printout stated "All Values Are The Same For One Class Level."

As illustrated in Table 5, students of both continuing education and curriculum instructors perceived that (1) student involvement and professionalism behaviors or conditions occurred often in their classes; (2) counseling occurred occasionally; and (3) individual inattention and organization behaviors occurred seldom. On the other hand, students in continuing education classes perceived that control behaviors or conditions occurred occasionally whereas students in curriculum classes perceived that control behaviors occurred often.

T-tests indicated that significant differences occurred between the summary scores of six of the seven factors. (Using the SAS TTEST procedure, summary scores could not be derived for the distrust and detachment factor. The note on the printout stated "All values are the same for one class level.") Students in continuing education classes perceived that student involvement and professionalism behaviors or conditions occurred more frequently in their classes than the students in curriculum classes perceived that these behaviors or conditons occurred. On the other hand, students in continuing education classes perceived that behaviors or conditions of control, counseling, individual inattention, and organization occurred less than students in curriculum classes perceived that these behaviors or conditions occurred.

When one considers Knowles' concept of andragogy, most of these differences are not surprising. According to Knowles, the evaluation procedure is a major conceptual difference between andragogical and pedagogical learning: in pedagogical

learning, evaluation is primarily by the teacher; in andragogical learning, evaluation is by mutual (teacher-learner) assessment of self-collected evidence. Consequently, one would expect to find that continuing education instructors are perceived by their students as significantly less controlling (1.23) than curriculum instructors are perceived by their students to be. One would also expect to find that continuing education students perceived that their instructors provided more student involvement behaviors than curriculu students perceived their instructors to provide (.68): procedures to involve the learners in the design, operation, and evaluation of an educational program are a major characteristic of andragogical learning. This may also account for the fact that continuing education instructors were perceived by their students to provide less organization behavior (.42) than curriculum instructors were perceived to display by their students. Nor is it surprising that continuing education instructors are perceived to display less individual inattention (.53) than curriculum instructors were perceived to display--this too is an important aspect of the role of the andragogical teacher.

Two of the differences between the summary scores for curriculum and continuing education instructors, however, are unexpected. First, continuing education instructors were perceived by their students as displaying fewer counseling behaviors. This suggests that a teacher's concern for a learner's growth in self-understanding may be more of a function of a learner characteristic, such as

age, than of program. Second, continuing education instructors were perceived by their students to display more professionalism behaviors than curriculum instructors were perceived by their students to display. This suggests that all instructors who participated in the study were expected by their students to explain clearly, maintain certain standards, trust students to behave reasonably, know their subject area, and give grades that reflect a student's grasp of the subject taught.

Implications

The preceding discussion of the differences between the teaching behaviors of continuing education and curriculum instructors is only a tentative beginning to an exploration of the teaching behavior of adult educators. Further research using the EDQ or a modified questionnaire including student involvement items and a broader sample of educators could lead to a clearer definition of the differences between the ways continuing education and curriculum courses are organized and taught. Use of the EDQ could also help practitioners of adult education to evaluate their own teaching behavior. Combined with the use of an evaluative questionnaire, for example, this descriptive questionnaire could help adult educators to identify behaviors that students like or that they think helped them to learn best. It may also help adult educators to identify weaknesses in their teaching--things they do that interfere with student learning. This information could be used to alter or to improve adult education programs.

List of References

Alwin, D. F. 1973. "The Use of Factor Analysis in the Construction of Linear Composites." Sociological Methods and Research 2:200-211.

Barr, A. J., et al. 1976. A User's Guide to SAS 76. SAS Institute, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Boshier, R., and G. Riddell. 1978. "Education Participation Scale Factor for Older Adults." Adult Education 28:163-173.

Costin, F. 1971. "Empirical Test of the 'Teacher-Centered' Versus 'Student-Centered' Dichotomy." Journal of Educational Psychology 62:410-412.

Croft, D. B., and D. J. Cotter. 1974. "The Goal of Classroom Instruction: Entertainment or Learning?" Educational Considerations 1:1-5.

Deshpande, A. S., et al. 1970. "Student Perceptions of Engineering Instructor Behaviors and Their Relationships to the Evaluation of Instruction and Courses." American Educational Research Journal 7:289-305.

Gibb, C. A. 1955. "Classroom Behavior of the College Teacher." Educational and Psychological Measurement 15:254-263.

Hadley, H. N. 1975. "Development of an Instrument to Determine Adult Educators' Orientation: Andragogical or Pedagogical." Unpublished Dissertation. Boston University, Boston.

Isaacson, R. L., et al. 1964. "Dimensions of Student Evaluations of Teaching." Journal of Educational Psychology 55:344-351.

Kempfer, H. 1979. "What's Continuing Education." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years 3:11, 23.

Kerwin, M. A. 1979. "The Relationship of Selected Factors to the Educational Orientation of Andragogically- and Pedagogically-Oriented Educators Teaching in Four of North Carolina's Two-Year Colleges." Unpublished Dissertation. North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

Knowles, M. S. 1970. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. Association Press, New York.

----------. 1973. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. Gulf Publishing Company, Houston.

----------. 1975. Self-Directed Learning. Association Press, New York.

Morstain, P. R., and J. C. Smart. 1974. "Reasons for Participation in Adult Education Courses: A Multivariant Analysis of Group Differences." Adult Education 24:80-99.

Solomon, D., et al. 1963. Teaching Styles and Learning. Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Chicago.

Solomon, D. 1966. "Teacher Behavior Dimensions, Course Characteristics, and Student Evaluations of Teachers." American Educational Research Journal 3:35-47.

APPENDIX

EDUCATION DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

EDUCATIONAL DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Respond in terms of how frequently a condition or behavior has occurred. Do not respond in terms of "good" or "bad," but in terms of how often.

		has almost always occurred	has often occurred	has occasionally occurred	has seldom occurred	has almost never occurred
1.	Information has been presented by the instructor as absolute truth.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	The instructor has encouraged students to examine their own feelings, attitudes, and behaviors.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	The instructor has firmly directed the students' learning.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	Students have been treated by the instructor as if they are able to learn.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	The instructor has acted as if learning is an intellectual process of understanding ideas and acquiring skills.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.	Students have been allowed by the instructor to actively participate in deciding what is to be learned and how it is to be done.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7.	The instructor has given examinations regularly.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8.	Students have been helped by the instructor to organize the content and sequence of learning activities.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9.	The instructor has evaluated students' achievements and assigned grades.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10.	The instructor has obtained suggestions from students on how to improve his teaching.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11.	Competition among students has been encouraged by the instructor.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12.	The instructor has shown each student that the student's abilities and experiences are respected and valued.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	almost always	often	occasionally	seldom	almost never
13. The instructor has helped students to accept values of their society.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. The instructor's principal methods of teaching have been lecturing, assigned reading, or both lecturing and assigned reading.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. Individual differences among students have not been allowed by the instructor.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. The instructor has acted as if he is responsible for motivating students to learn what they ought to learn.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. The instructor has explained clearly.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. Students have been helped by the instructor to choose and develop their own directions for learning.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. Decisions about what should be taught, when, and how have been made by the instructor.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. The instructor has seldom known the average students as separate individuals.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. The instructor has not changed his expressed decisions without unusually good reasons.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. The instructor has taken time to develop a friendly and cooperative atmosphere in the classroom.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. The same standards have been maintained by the instructor in his program as in other accredited courses.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. The student has been allowed by the instructor to evaluate his achievement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. Competition among students has been discouraged by the instructor.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. The instructor has discussed his blunders and learnings with students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	almost always	often	occasionally	seldom	almost never
27. The instructor has asked questions that steer students toward truth.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. The instructor has helped the student define changes in behavior which the student desires and the instructor helps him try to make.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. Students have been trusted by the instructor to behave reasonably.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. Students have been treated by the instructor as competent to choose and carry out their own projects for learning.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. Students have been helped by the instructor to free themselves of fixed habits and patterns of thought that block their growth.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
32. The instructor has known his subject matter and has the ability to explain or demonstrate it clearly and interestingly.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
33. Students have been encouraged by the instructor to create their own learning activities and materials.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
34. The instructor has required assignments and graded them.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
35. The instructor has followed a topical outline course plan.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
36. Evaluation in this class is based entirely on the course objectives.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
37. Competition among students has been encouraged by the instructor.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
38. The instructor has provided students with opportunities to develop warm relationships with him and among students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
39. The instructor has helped students to live reasonable, orderly lives.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	almost always	often	occasionally	seldom	almost never
40. Students have been encouraged by the instructor to critically evaluate their society and try new behavior.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
41. The instructor has acted as if he is afraid to make a mistake.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
42. The instructor has acted as if maturity depends more on continuing growth in self-understanding than on growth in knowledge.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
43. The instructor has acted as if he knows, better than the students, what is best for them.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
44. Students have been allowed to "get off the subject" by the instructor.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
45. Students have been told by the instructor what should be learned and how it should be done.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
46. Learning objectives have been determined by the instructor to avoid wasting too much time in irrelevant discussion.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
47. The instructor has been concerned primarily with the needs of the student.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
48. Grades in this class reflect a student's grasp of the subject or skill taught.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
49. The instructor has made few required assignments.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
50. Students have been allowed by the instructor to prepare tests.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
51. Students have been allowed by the instructor to set their own goals.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
52. The instructor has helped each student learn what the student decides will aid him in achieving his personal goals.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
53. The instructor has taken great pains to prevent students from taking advantage of him.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	almost always	often	occasionally	seldom	almost never
54. The instructor has played it safe and has not taken chances.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
55. The instructor has encouraged cooperation among students and has invited them to take risks and experiment.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
56. The instructor has carefully planned the work for the class.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
57. Group activities have been used by the instructor rather than such methods as lectures.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
58. The instructor's relationships with students have been impersonal.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
59. The instructor has planned units of work with the students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
60. The instructor has set up a clear plan and has stuck with it.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )